## PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019-6064

TELEPHONE (212) 373-3000

LLOYD K GARRISON (1946-1991)
RANDOLPH E PAUL (1946-1956)
SIMON H RIFKIND (1950-1995)
LOUIS S WEISS (1927-1950)
JOHN F WHARTON (1927-1977)

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

212-373-3311

WRITER'S DIRECT FACSIMILE

212-492-0311

WRITER'S DIRECT E-MAIL ADDRESS

rfinzi@paulweiss.com

UNIT 3601 OFFICE TOWER A, BEIJING FORTUNE PLAZA
NO 7 DONGSANHUAN ZHONGLU
CHAOYANG DISTRICT
BEIJING 100020
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
TELEPHONE (86-10) 5828-8300

12TH FLOOR, HONG KONG CLUB BUILDING 3A CHATER ROAD, CENTRAL HONG KONG TELEPHONE (852) 2846-0300

> ALDER CASTLE 10 NOBLE STREET LONDON EC2V 7JU, U K TELEPHONE (44 20) 7367 1600

FUKOKU SEIMEI BUILDING 2-2 UCHISAIWAICHO 2-CHOME CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 100-0011, JAPAN TELEPHONE (81-3) 3597-8101

TORONTO-DOMINION CENTRE
77 KING STREET WEST, SUITE 3100
PO BOX 226
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5K 1J3
TELEPHONE (416) 504-0520

2001 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1047 TELEPHONE (202) 223-7300

500 DELAWARE AVENUE, SUITE 200 POST OFFICE BOX 32 WILMINGTON, DE 19899-0032 TELEPHONE (302) 655-4410 MATTHEW W ABBOTT
ALLAN J ARFA
ROBERT A ATKINS
DOHN F BAUGHMAN
LYNN B BAYARD
DANIEL J BELLER
CRAIGA A BENSON
MITCHELL L BERG
MARKE BERGHMAN
H CHRISTOPHER BOCHNING
ANGELO BONVINO
JAMES L BROCHIN
RICHARD J BRONSTEIN
DAVID W BROWN
RICHARD J BRONSTEIN
DAVID W BROWN
RICHARD J BRONSTEIN
DAVID W COMPBELL\*
JESSICA S CAREY
JESSICA S CAREY
JESSICA S CAREY
JESSICA S CAREY
VONNE Y F CHAN
LEWIS R CLAYTON
LEWIS R CLAYTON
LEWIS R CLAYTON
LEWIS R CLAYTON
ARIEL J DECKELBAUM
VONDE S CHARLES E DAVIDOW
DOUGLAS R DAVIS
CHARLES E DAVIDOW
DOUGLAS R DAVIS
CHARLES E DAVIDOW
CHARLES E DAVIDOW
DOUGLAS R DAVIS
CHARLES E DAVIDOW
CHARLES E DAVIDOW
LOUGLAS R DAVIS
CHARLES E DAVIDOW
LOUGLAS R DAVIS
CHARLES E DAVIDOW
LOUGLAS R DAVIS
CHARLES E FISCH
ROBERT C FILEDER
MARTIN FLUMENBAUM
ANICHE S FIRCH
ROBERT C FILEDER
MARTIN FLUMENBAUM
MARC FALCONE
ANDREW F FOLEY
HARRING LS FEREY
MARTIN FLUMENBAUM
ANDREW L GAINES
KENNETH A GALLO
MICHAEL E GERTZMAN
MICHAEL E GERTZMAN
MICHAEL E GERTZMAN
MICHAEL E GOOGE JR
ANDREW L GAINES
KENNETH A GALLO
MICHAEL S GOOGE JR
ANDREW L GAINES
KENNETH A GALLO
MICHAEL E GERTZMAN
MICHAEL E GOOGE JR
ANDREW L GAINES
KENNETH A GALLO
MICHAEL E GERTZMAN

MEREDITH J. KANE
ROBERTA A KAPLAN
BRAD S KARP
JOHN C KENNED
JOHN C KENNER
DAVID K LAKHOHIR
STEPHEN P LAMB\*
JOHN L LANGE
DAVID K LAKHOHIR
STEPHEN P LAMB\*
JOHN LANGE
JOHN LANGE
DAVID W MASOTTI
LEDWIN S MAYNARD
DAVID W MAYO
ELIZABETH R MCCOLM
MARK F MENDELSOHN
WARK F MENDELSOHN
WORD W MAYO
ELIZABETH R MCCOLM
MARK F MENDELSOHN
WORD W MYERSON
TOATHERINE NYARADY
JOHN J O'NEIL
ALEX YOUNG K OH
BRAD R OKUNRE R
WALER RICHAN
WALE P FRIMUTTER
VALERIE E RADWANER
CARL L REISNER
WALE P FRIMUTER
WALTER RICHAN
WALTER RICHAN
WALTER RICHAN
WALTER RICHAN
WALTER SCHUME
WALTER SCHUME
TARBERT B SCHUME
AND SEEN SHEW
MARTH SCHUME
TERRY E SCHUME
JAMES H SCHUME
JAMES H SCHUME
JAMES H SCHUME
ROBERT B SCHUME
ROBERT B SCHUME
JAMES H SCHUME
MOSES SILVERMAN
STEVEN SIMKIN
JOSEPH J SIBELU
MARTH N SIEULAN
MOSES SILVERMAN
STEVEN SIMKIN
JOSEPH J SIEULAN
MARTH N SOELUMA
MARTH N WALLSH
LAWRENCE I WITTORCHIC
MARK B WLAZLO
JULIA MASON WOOD
JORDAN E YARCTT
MONG YO'NON KI, JR
TROBERT ZOCHOWSKI, JR
TROBERT ZOCHOWSKI, JR
TROBERT ZOCHOWSKI, JR
TROBERT ZOCHOWSKI, JR

\*NOT ADMITTED TO THE NEW YORK BAR

October 4, 2013

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Thurgood Marshall U.S. Courthouse 40 Foley Square New York, NY 10007

Re: SEC v. Contorinis, No. 12-1723-cv (2d Cir.)

Dear Ms. Wolfe:

We represent defendant-appellant Joseph Contorinis in the above-captioned appeal, which is scheduled to be argued on Monday, October 7, 2013. On September 30, 2013, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") submitted a letter to the Court ("SEC Ltr.") arguing that Mr. Contorinis's discussion of *Grupo Mexicano de Desarrollo, S.A.* v. *Alliance Bond Fund, Inc.*, 527 U.S. 308 (1999) ("*Grupo*"), is "not properly before the court," and that the case is otherwise not instructive here. We respectfully disagree.

Mr. Contorinis has consistently asserted, both in the district court and on appeal, that any order of disgorgement that goes beyond the amount of money acquired by Mr. Contorinis exceeds the permissible scope of the equitable remedy of disgorgement. (See, e.g., Def.'s Mem. of Law in Opp'n to the SEC's Mot. for Summ. J., No. 09 Civ. 1043 (RJS) (S.D.N.Y.), Dkt. No. 147, at 7, 9–10.) In his opening brief on this appeal, Mr. Contorinis specifically argued that any such disgorgement was "beyond the court's equitable powers." (Br. at 15 (internal quotation marks omitted and citing, among others, SEC v. Cavanagh, 445 F.3d 105, 116, 177 n.25 (2d Cir. 2006)); see also id. ("It necessarily follows that a defendant must have actually received the sums in

Case: 12-1723 Document: 127 Page: 2 10/04/2013 1058891 2

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe

2

question for the court to be able to exercise its equitable powers in ordering such sums to be disgorged." (emphasis added)).) And in his reply brief, Mr. Contorinis reiterated that "the disgorgement ordered in this case exceeded the district court's authority by going beyond what was required to return Mr. Contorinis to the position he was in before the alleged violation occurred." (Reply at 2; see also id. at 3 (stating that the purpose of disgorgement is "to return a defendant to the status quo that existed prior to any wrongdoing, thus preventing unjust enrichment"); id. at 4 ("Courts have widely held that in order to constitute a defendant's unjust or ill-gotten gains subject to disgorgement, those gains must have been received by the defendant.").)

Mr. Contorinis's citation to *Grupo* is just further support for the argument that the disgorgement ordered by the district court in this case is inconsistent with the permissible contours and fundamental purpose of the equitable remedy of disgorgement. (*See id.* at 15–16 (citing *Grupo*, 527 U.S. at 318, 319, 329); *id.* at 15 ("disgorgement has traditionally been limited to a defendant's own ill-gotten gains, or those acquired by a tippee working in concert with the defendant").) The court's equity jurisdiction should not be expanded "to allow for the redemption of profits never received, enjoyed, or controlled by the defendant," (*id.* at 16), as the district court did here when it ordered Mr. Contorinis to disgorge amounts that went to an innocent third party (*i.e.*, the Fund). Requiring Mr. Contorinis to disgorge the Fund's profits—an amount that vastly exceeds his own ill-gotten gains—would result in a penalty, placing the ordered disgorgement outside the court's equity jurisdiction. (*See, e.g.*, Br. at 15 ("[A]wards that exceed the defendant's gains are punitive and[, therefore,] beyond the court's equitable powers." (internal quotation marks omitted)); Reply at 6 ("disgorgement must be limited to a defendant's own gain to avoid having forfeiture's punitive attributes").)

Respectfully submitted,

Roberto Finzi

cc: All counsel of record via ECF

Neither the Commission, the U.S. Attorney's Office, nor anyone else has ever alleged that Mr. Contorinis was a tipper; there are no tippees' ill-gotten gains to consider here. (See Br. at 19; Reply at 11–14.)